Compare and Contrast the Management Theories

Dr. Corinne Bates

s10map@aol.com

Abstract- **The paper compare and contrast the management theories. The twentieth century has brought in a number of management theories which have helped shaped our view of management in the present business environment. These emerging theories have enabled managers to appreciate new patterns of thinking, new ways of organizing and new ways of managing organizations and people. Over the years these different theories have enabled the study of trends that have taken place in the management field. The major management viewpoints which include the classical, behavioral and contingency approaches have assisted in the formation of the contemporary twenty-first century management theory and techniques. Although, there are significant differences among all these approaches they seem to be unified by the efforts of improving an organization's efficiency in terms of proper human resources management. Furthermore, the dissimilarities seen in these approaches are due to the always changing organizations and environments which demand new management practices and techniques be applied to maintain the efficiency of an organization.**

I. ABRAHAM MASLOW HIERARCHY NEEDS

Maslow would be considered a classic. His human relations' era of behavioral scientists under school of system of management thought is considered to be Organizational Behavior Theory. Maslow, build on Henry Murray work to form need theory oldest notions of motivation, which is the most widely, recognized theories of motivation. Maslow proposed a theoretical hierarchy that identified at least five sets of needs: physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization. These needs were related to one another and were arranged in a hierarchy of prepotency (urgency of the drive).

The most basic drives were physiological, when these needs were satisfied, prepotency diminished and the next higher need emerged to dominate behavior. Once a need was gratified, it no longer motivated behavior. In Maslow's theory people moved up the ladder of needs as each level be satisfied, and they could move in a reverse direction if fulfillment of a lower order need was threatened or removed. Human acted as if they were unfilled cups and all needs, were really never fully gratified.

The top rung of the hierarchy was self-actualization or "what a man can be must be". This was self-fulfillment, or the attainment of what a person had the potential of becoming.

Maslow's opinion about McGregor and Drucker principles; just as an individual's reaction to a personal crisis would be to move to lower order needs become defensive, or used other adaptive mechanisms if the normal striving for growth and self-actualization were threatened and organization would also revert to previous coping mechanisms. He had his doubts about the validity of Theory Y, a good deal of evidence upon which McGregor bases his conclusions from research from the clinic, a study of neurotic people.

II. FREDERICK HERZBERG TWO FACTOR THEORY

Herzberg and his associates began research to discover the importance of attitudes toward work and the experiences, both good and bad, that worker reported. He asked workers, to think of a time when they felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about their jobs, either past or present. He set out to discover the kinds of things that made people both happy and satisfied on their jobs or unhappy and dissatisfied. From the response of the people he was able to isolate two different kinds of needs that appeared to be independent. When people reported unhappiness or job dissatisfaction, they attributed those felling to their job environment, or the job context. When people reported happiness or satisfaction, they attributed the feeling to work itself or the job content.

Herzberg called the factors identified in the job context "hygiene" factors "for they act in a manner analogous to the principles of medical hygiene. Hygiene operates to remove health hazards from the environment of man. The hygiene factors include supervision, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salaries, company policies and administrative, practices, benefits, and job security. When these factors deteriorated below what the worker considered optimal by the workers dissatisfaction was removed, this did not lead to positive attitudes, however but to some sort of a neutral state of neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction.

The factors that led to positive attitudes, satisfaction and motivation were called the motivators or things in the job content. The motivators were factors of achievement recognition for accomplishment, challenging work, increased job responsibility, and opportunity for growth and development. If present, these factors led to higher motivation. Herzberg was saying that traditional assumptions of motivation about wage incentive, improving inter personal relations and establishing proper working conditions did not lead to higher motivation. They removed dissatisfaction and acted to prevent problems, but once these traditional motivators were optimal they did not lead to positive motivation, according to Herzberg, management should recognize that hygiene was necessary, once it had neutralized dissatisfaction, it did not lead to positive results. Only the motivators led people to superior's performance.

Herzberg and Maslow are similar in contrast to the motivational theory. According to Maslow, once someone is has satisfied at their current level they will continue to go to the next level. This was a motivation factor to achieve self-actualization. As the same, Herzberg believes that only the motivators led people to superior's performance, and that once it had neutralized dissatisfaction it led to positive results. The both believe that motivation leads one to success in their lives.

III. DOUGLAS MCGREGOR THEORY X & Y

Theory X, which was to represent the traditional view of direction and control. Theory X assumptions were 1). The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can. 2). Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives. 3). The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all.

McGregor thought that these X assumptions were the ones prevailing in modern industrial practice, hard X; presumable scientific management to soft X; human relations. He maintained that no fundamental shift in assumptions or managerial philosophies had occurred. McGregor Theory Y was put forth as a modest beginning for new theory with respect to the management of human resources. Theory Y assumptions were: 1). The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest. The average human being does not inherently dislike work. 2). External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed. 3). Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. The most significant of such reward the satisfaction of ego and self-actualization needs, can be direct products of efforts directed toward organizational objectives. 4). The average human beings learn, under proper conditions, not only to accept but also to seek responsibility. Avoidance of responsibility, lack of ambition, and emphasis on security is generally consequences of experience, not inherent human characteristics. 5). The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population. 6). Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of theaverage human beings are only partially utilized.

McGregor called Theory Y "the integration of individual and organizational goals" and held that it led to the "creation of conditions such that the members of the organization can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise."

McGregor believe people were treated largely a self-fulfilling prophecy: if managers assumed that people were lazy and treated them as if they were, then they would be lazy. Also, if managers assumed that people desired challenging work and exploited this premise by increasing individual discretion, workers would in fact respond by seeking more and more responsibility.

IV. WILLIAM OUCHI THEORY Z

Ouchi and Jaeger observed that U.S. management had roots in the American tradition of individualism, whereas the Japanese emphasized consensus and collectivity. As the traditional sources of affiliation in U.S. society (church, family, etc) continued to decline, a different type of organization one that restored wholeness, cohesion, and stability was necessary. Ouchi and Jaeger called their different management style Type Z, which was elevated to Theory Z and which allegedly combined the best of U.S. and Japanese management in a humanistic manner and would lead all organizations to superior results.

Japanese managerial style led to numerous explanations of the Japanese success story: 1). Superior manufacturing practices, such as just-in-time materials arrivals: 2). Qualities, quantify, or cost factors: 3). Employee participation in decision-making, which was also a foundation of quality circles: 4). Better product quality because of statistical quality control techniques: 5). Consensus decision making 6). Lifetime employee security: 7). Judging performance by long-term rather than short run measures; and miscellaneous other reasons.

Maslow had a Theory Z and so did Ureic. Durkheim had proposed a collective consciousness to restore cohesion, allay anomie, and provide social stability. In Durkheim, Mayo had found his prescription for social solidarity. Theory Z as a reincarnation of Durkheim's view of industrialization breaking up peoples' traditional roots and causing anomie. Those who accepted this Durkheim-Mayo, Ouchi assumption would conclude that management should reconstruct the organizational situation so that new norms could be established, primary groups fostered, and stability and cohesiveness promoted.

V. ALDERFER ERG THEORY

Alderfer identified three categories of needs:
  a. Existence – the need for physical well-being
  b. Relatedness – the need for satisfying interpersonal relationships
  c. Growth – the need for continuing personal growth and development
     Alderfer says people sometimes jump around the hierarchy, doing what they can
if workers can't achieve higher needs they may regress.

Additional research is needed to shed more light on its validity; the supporting evidence on ERG theory is stronger than that for Maslow's theory. The combined

satisfaction-progression and frustration-regression principles provide the manger with a more flexible approach to understanding human needs than does Maslow's strict hierarchy.

VI. COMPARE HERZBERG, MCGREGOR OZUCH, ALDERFER, AND MASLOW THEORIES

McGregor's answer to an understanding of the worker's response to the work situation is derived from Maslow's familiar theory of the need hierarchy. In McGregor's popularization of this theory in relation to modern industrial society he argues that business organization have largely satisfied all the lower order needs. For the manager or the managerial ideologist, then, the satisfaction of the ego needs provide a powerful means of the ego needs provides a powerful means of integrating the individual with the enterprise.

Herzberg reaches much the same conclusion with a different route. His starting point was how to explain variations in the motivation to work and how to increase the motivation to work. Herzberg and McGregor then illustrate the main characteristics of the psychological universalistic approach. They are psychological in that they analyze occupational behavior in terms of needs, satisfactions, and motivations. They are universalistic in the sense that they suggest that there are certain needs shared by workers of all types and levels and their response to the work situation can be explained in terms of the extent to which these needs are satisfied.

When Herzberg and Maslow models are compared both emphasize the same set of relationships. Maslow centers on human needs of the psychological person at work or anywhere else. Herzberg focuses on that same person in terms of how job conditions affect his basic needs. Herzberg motivation maintenance model seems to say in general is that managerial and professional workers have reach a stage of socioeconomic progress.

Ozuch Theory Z is similar to McGregor theory X & Y; they both have similar ideas. Ozuch has combined both McGregor's theory X & Y to make up a theory Z, which would conclude a manager that has both traits.

Alderfer, ERG theory differs from Maslow's theory in three basic respects:

1) The theory collapses Maslow's five need categories into three: existence needs relate to a person's desire for physiological and material well-being; relatedness needs represent the desire for satisfying interpersonal relationships; and growth needs are desires for continued personal growth and development.

2) Maslow's theory argues that individuals progress up the hierarchy as a result of the satisfaction of lower order needs, ERG theory includes a "frustration-regression" principle, whereby an already satisfied lower level need can become activated when a higher level need cannot be satisfied.

3) Maslow, a person focuses on one need at a time. In contrast, ERG theory contends that more than one need may be activated at the same time.

REFERENCES

[1] Alderfer, C.P. 1969. An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 4: 142-175.

[2] Hershey, P. and K.H. Blanchard. 1977. Management of organizational behavior. 3rd.ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[3] Nahavandi, A. 2012.The Art and Science of Leadership.6th Edition, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.